

REMARKS

Claims 1-17 are pending. Claims 1-9 and 13-15 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thornton (US Patent No. 6,363,065) in view of Tashiro (US Patent No. 6,724,749).

As stated in the office action, Thornton does not teach the insertion of a locally significant message into a globally significant message. Further, Thornton does not teach supplementary services as they are defined in the specification. The office action referred to 1210 and 1245 in Figure 12, but those messages do not call out nor even suggest supplementary services. See Thornton, col. 42, line 53, through col. 43, line 48.

The addition of Tashiro does nothing to overcome this deficiency of Thornton. The office action refers to Figure 13 of Tashiro, but as described in col. 10, line 11 through col. 12, line 67, Figure 13 is about replacing the traditional phone path with a path in an IP network. There is no mention of supplementary services. Further, the office action relies upon Tashiro for including a locally significant message in a globally significant message, but Tashiro only refers to globally significant messages. The only message manipulation is to add in the relevant numbers to the globally significant messages, which is merely part of the globally significant message creation in any network.

As amended, claims 1 and 13 require that supplementary services be defined as those services that rely upon the presence of another service to operate, as supported in the specification, in the paragraph on page 1, line 22, as an example. Further, the amended claims require that the locally significant message be a message that is otherwise not transmitted to other stations on the network. This is supported in the specification, in the paragraph beginning on line 3 on page 1, as an example.

Therefore, the combination of references does not teach supplementary services or the use of locally significant messages. It is therefore submitted that claims 1 and 13 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

Claims 2-9 depend from claim 1 and inherently contain all of the limitations of that claim. As discussed above, the prior art does not teach, show nor suggest all of the limitations of the base claim, much less the further embodiments of the dependent claims. It is therefore submitted that claims 2-9 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

Claims 14-15 depend from claim 13 and inherently contain all of the limitations of that claim. As discussed above, the prior art does not teach, show nor suggest all of the limitations of the base claim, much less the further embodiments of the dependent claims. It is therefore submitted that claims 14-15 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

Claims 10-12, 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Thornton.

As discussed above, Thornton does not teach the insertion of a locally significant message into a globally significant message. Claims 10, 16 and 17 have been amended to require that the network device have the capability of inserting a locally significant message into a globally significant message. It is therefore submitted that claims 10, 16 and 17 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

Claims 11-12 depend from claim 10 and inherently contain all of the limitations of that claim. As discussed above, the prior art does not teach, show nor suggest all of the limitations of the base claim, much less the further embodiments of the dependent claims. It is therefore submitted that claims 11-12 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

No new matter has been added by this amendment. Allowance of all claims is requested. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (503) 222-3613 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

Customer No. 20575

Respectfully submitted,
MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.

Julie L. Reed

Julie L. Reed
Reg. No. 35,349

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.
210 SW Morrison St., Suite 400
Portland, OR 97204
503-222-3613